REMARKS

The non-final office action of February 3 has been considered and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 12-26 remain pending. Claims 12, 13, 17, 18, 22, and 23 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C § 112

Claims 13 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicants have amended claims 13 and 18 to correct the minor informalities. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection under 103

Claims 12-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 6,611,262, hereinafter "Suzuki") and Cheng et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,724,407, hereinafter, "Cheng"). Applicants traverse.

Claim 12 recites, *inter alia*,

> creating a three-dimensional object with at least two surfaces using two-dimensional information obtained from the uniform resource locator; *placing the three-dimensional object in the created virtual three-dimensional space such that more than one surface of the three-dimensional object is concurrently viewable.*

(Emphasis added.) Suzuki fails to teach or suggest such a feature. Suzuki is silent on creating a three-dimensional (3D) object with at least two surfaces and further placing the 3D object in the 3D space such that more than one surface of the 3D object is concurrently viewable as recited in claim 1. Indeed, Suzuki does not describe such features because Suzuki is directed to multiplexing of compressed image data into the same bit stream. See col. 8, lines 2-8. At best, Suzuki describes an object with one wall (still picture), which obviously fails to constitute an object with at least two surfaces.

Moreover, Cheng fails to cure the deficiencies of Suzuki. For example, Cheng explicitly describes *not* allowing a viewer to concurrently view more than one surface of the 3D object in order to force the user to unintentionally register hits on certain hypermedia resources. See col.

5, lines 50-65 and FIG. 3. Such a desired result in Cheng would be circumvented if Cheng were to display multiple surfaces of FIG. 3 concurrently to the user. Therefore, Cheng fails to teach or suggest the claim 12 feature of placing the three-dimensional object in the created virtual three-dimensional space such that more than one surface of the three-dimensional object is concurrently viewable. As such, even assuming but not conceding that a combination of Suzuki and Cheng would have been proper, such a combination would have failed to result in each and every feature of claim 12.

Claims 17 and 22 recite features similar to claim 12 and are patentably distinct from Suzuki and Cheng for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 12.

Claims 13-16, 18-21 and 23-26 ultimately depend on claims 12, 17 and 22, respectively. As such, they are distinct from Suzuki and Cheng for at least the same reasons as claims 12, 17 and 22 and in addition to the advantageous features recited therein.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same. Should the Examiner find that a telephonic or personal interview would expedite passage to issue of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Date: May 4, 2009

By: /Rick H. Lin/
Rick Hang-Ting Lin
Reg. No. 61,933

1100 13th Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
Phone: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001

CAM/RL/kb